

ASF Meet and Confer Notes

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Meeting Chair –Jean Clarke

I. Information Items

A. Review of Notes

1. No feedback on the notes.

B. MSU President's Report (R. Davenport)

1. Introduced Paul Hustoles, who was approached to fill in behind the K. Clark departure. P. Hustoles had served in advancement in the past. Please welcome P. Hustoles.
2. (P. Hustoles). I believe in collective bargaining, and am excited to be here.
3. We have a bonding project in the future (\$6 million) to backfill when the new Clinical Sciences building reopens.
4. The enrollment mgmt. team is doing a great job! One of the reasons we are doing as well as an institution is because we have nailed enrollment mgmt. We have goals, we have a plan, and this is great for our future!
5. The clinical sciences building is delayed, we need to hope for good weather.
6. The institution is doing sesquicentennial planning. P. Hustoles is doing some planning on this. This initiative is expanding, many in the room will have a role.
7. I am not happy with the funding allocation model coming out of MnSCU. We are not getting our fair share. Funding and allocation revolve around FYE/full-time equivalent, and this seems to be omitted from the data being shared with the legislature. This is a mystery.
 1. By not measuring by full-year equivalents, numbers are misleading (when comparing to St. Cloud, for example).

C. MSUAASF President's Report (J. Clarke)

1. We have members not here today due to international orientation currently taking place.
2. New Student Orientation tomorrow is a large undertaking for many of our members.
3. Our members had a busy winter break season preparing for this new semester.

D. Vice President Student Affairs & Enrollment Management Report (D. Jones)

1. Enrollment snapshot
 1. At the end of the fall semester we were down about 45 full-time equivalents.
 2. For this spring, our NEFY students is down.
 3. Our transfer student rate is flat.
 4. Our international numbers are strong.
 5. Retention is what drives the spring semester. As of this morning, we are down 261 headcount. This is equivalent to 100 FY students.
 6. Biggest gaps are between the junior to senior year. This likely cannot be made up.
2. Looking ahead to next fall:
 1. Intent to enroll is up 19%. This is about 200 students up from last year at this time.
 2. Housing is up 25% right now, this is about 250 students.
3. (B. Jones) Last year we waived application fees, this year we did not. Admit numbers are starting to level off.
4. I appreciate everyone's work over the holidays.

II. Discussion Items

A. Budget (R. Straka)

1. This is a month when lots of reports are due to the central office for legislative purposes.
 - i. Most reports show a reduction in spending (versus reallocating funds from one program to the next).
 - ii. A financial recovery plan is being prepared and submitted by the end of January. We are in good shape, this report will reflect that. We have the strongest cash flow. We have high depreciation expenses as a result in investments in physical plant in recent years. This is not a concern.
2. The system is considering making a 21 million dollar supplemental request. Our share would be just over 1 million.

3. I am considering offering another budget forum to campus to provide an update and to lay out financial scenarios during the upcoming spring semester.

B. HR Topics (S. Sargent)

1. Human Resource Vacancies were shared.
2. Trisha Stoner has resigned, and is moving to Mankato Public School. We took this as an opportunity to realign based on division instead of classified versus unclassified. This is a more even workload.
3. (J. Clarke) Fixed terms are coming due. (S. Sargent) Yes, searches are moving forward.

C. Fall 2016 Registration Proposal (April 4-19, 2016) (G. Zierdt/M. Brock/T. Boehler)

1. See handouts.
2. (G. Zierdt) We have exceptional news. MSU is leading nationally in the areas related to registration.
3. (T. Boehler) Last summer, conversations began about changing the registration windows to try to capture students who leave for the summer without registering.
 - i. Registration will start April 4th, about a week earlier than Spring 2015.
 - ii. This gives more room before Finals Week.
 - iii. Discussions with SRCs has taken place on this topic.
 - iv. This impacts early registration and priority registration groups, moving them to a registration window to the end of March. This too impacts advising for these groups.
 - v. (J. Clarke) Is there a plan in place to promote this change when this goes from proposal to actuality? Answer: Yes, via email and physical postings. Schedule publication will come out earlier as well.
 - vi. (J. Clarke) Are there conversation happening to make sure there are less changes to the schedule once it is posted? (G. Zierdt) There is always a lot of movement, and this has been identified as a serious issue. Work is being done to analyze this to pinpoint where improvements can be made. This is all related to getting students to register sooner, which is why this is a point of focus. Please provide feedback on areas you would like to see improvements in these areas.
 - vii. (C. Lindsay) Will spring registration be moving forward too?
 1. (T. Boehler). That is the initial plan. Moving advising and registration a week ahead is helpful and the goal.
 2. (G. Zierdt) If we don't catch students at the end of spring semester, once they leave, we lose them, and have less opportunity to influence behavior.
 - viii. See folders packet on best practices and trends. (G. Zierdt)

D. Diversity Education Requirement Update (MSUAASF)

1. (M. Wells). In January the steering committee is being populated by each bargaining unit. The proposed plan is moving forward.

E. Update on HLC (MSUAASF)

1. (L. Akey)—See handout.
2. Thank you to the representative (B. Jones) for serving on this subcommittee.
3. March 28-29 is our visit. We are in the last 4 months. There is still a lot of activity occurring.
4. A student satisfaction survey will go out Jan 18-29th. This date was mandated, not chosen.
5. February—Site visit preparations will focus on entities we believe will be focus areas for the visit team to make sure they are updated on the criteria we are evaluated on.
6. March—final preparations. The visit team determines the visit schedule. This won't happen until close to our visit. We won't know who they want to meet with until closer to the visit.
7. The biggest message for your members is that this is an accreditation year and they will be here March 28-29th.

F. Third Party Extended Education Partnership (M. Wells/M. Gustafson/K. Retherford)

1. (M. Wells). We have had a long standing commitment to extended education. This was part of our goals and objectives which were reviewed.
 - i. There have been campus discussion about working with Academic Partnerships to help us in these areas. See FAQ handout.
 - ii. The attached document explains what this is and why this is being considered.
 - iii. The process for consultation and decision making is also outlined.
 - iv. This plan is about serving students who cannot come to our campus. This fits with our master plan and charting the future.
2. (M. Gustafson)—VP for Strategic Partnerships.

- i. There is 100s of hours of work put into this 15 minute summary.
 - ii. Critical Information—Visit the website for more information. There will be two general sessions with a presentation and to solicit feedback. There is excitement on this.
 - iii. It is fun representing MSU to develop online programs and bring this to students who cannot physically make it to MSU.
 - iv. Academic Partnerships—they can do things we cannot do. They are best in class. 100s of hours have gone into exploring this group.
 - v. This is not a proposal. We are trying to collect information. We have an open door to hear more about this.
 - vi. Academic Partnerships reached out to us.
 - vii. As a group, we have moved from doubters to believers.

3. (J. Haar)-Dean of College of Education and Extended Edu.
 - i. I was a doubter, now I'm a believer.
 - ii. I was skeptical—another vendor who will give us a product.
 - iii. This is a powerful program, with depth and integrity. We cannot duplicate this. This can help us provide our program to students we wouldn't reach. They help with recruitment, marketing, and retention.
 - iv. This will add to what we already offer. This is a partnership, not just a contract.

4. (K. Retherford)-Dean of Allied Health and Nursing
 - i. We don't have the capacity to serve the students on our waiting list. The market is ready for more baccalaureates in nursing, not just the RN. Someone is going to step up, we may be the ones to step up by this partnership with Academic Partnerships.
 - ii. We are encouraged by the professionalism.

5. (J. Hebenstreit..)-Chair of School of Nursing
 - i. She working with University of Texas at Arlington who has already working with Academic Partnerships.
 - ii. Academic Partnerships has helped grow partnerships with hospitals that help the nursing students get their internships.
 - iii. They have expanded their ability to graduate more nursing students.
 - iv. Nursing faculty are not on board yet. We do need to be open and flexible, mainly because we cannot get the clinical sites. Academic Partnerships can help us do this.

6. (M. Gustafson)
 - i. We need to ask the right questions and get the right answers.
 - ii. They have 50 customers.
 - iii. Their goals are lined up with Charting the Future
 - iv. Related to Diversity—this will impact students who cannot get here.
 - v. They are best in class, so are we.
 - vi. There is a 92% graduation rate with this program.

7. Questions
 - i. (B. Jones). How do they expand our capacity to increase nursing?
 1. (K. Retherford) The delivery of the curriculum is our faculty. There is a section model led by a position that is similar to a GA who covers each section. They help us hire the GAs who directly oversee the course. They help recruit the students utilizing their special relationships.
 2. (J. Haar). The GAs are at higher standards (some have doctoral degrees).
 - ii. (J. Clarke) Is this taking away jobs from people who could do this work from ASF.
 1. (K. Retherford). Our current staff (ASF) are overloaded. Academic Partnerships could provide that relief.
 - iii. (R. Wheeler) So the people that carry out this program wouldn't be our employees?
 1. (M. Wells) We could hire them.
 2. (M. Gustafson). Some of these people would be consultants. They would not get a W-2 from us.
 3. (J. Haar). There are options on this, we can hire the staff or use theirs.

8. (R. Davenport)—This program could help us provide opportunities we do not currently provide. MnSCUs online program hasn't served many students. This program would attract students that likely wouldn't be

served by one of the MnSCU schools. Let's pilot this and see if this works. Then let's debug the system.
We will make sure that our home department has the control.

- i. (R. Wheeler) So an RFP will be going out?
- ii. (R. Straka). Yes, without a doubt. Especially if it is a 3-5 year contract. It'll have to go to the BoT for approval.
- iii. Normandale has done this at a smaller scale.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jamie Van Boxel
MSUAASF Secretary